

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XXIV, Issue No. 8

February 2019

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

Assault Speech and Hate Weapons – the media weapons that would make Orwell proud

By Rob Morse

It is dangerous to let other people do our thinking for us. We seem certain we can define “hate speech”. We’re convinced that “assault weapons” are bad. Both terms have been manipulated by politicians and the media to mean anything they want them to mean. We were sold such a twisted-logic of lies that it would be funny.. if it were not so dangerous.

Elites with armed bodyguards tell us to give up our tools of self-defense. We’re called toxic-hateful-deplorable-clingers if we object. “Assault weapon” is a debating term and so is “hate speech”. An assault weapon is any firearm a politician wants to confiscate. “Hate speech” are any statements that criticize the politician’s latest voting bloc.

Wayne LaPierre, the executive vice president of the National Rifle Association, has armed guards at work and at home. Gun-confiscation spokesman Shannon Watts has armed guards too. I’ve seen them. The important distinction is that La Pierre says we should have the same protection that he has. Watts wants the rest of us disarmed while she remains protected. My response is simple. If being disarmed is so great, then you go first and show us by example.

That is only the beginning of the hypocrisy. Hollywood media events are “gun-free” zones, yet they have armed security teams all around the venue.

You have examples of gross hypocrisy closer to home. That gun in your safe is an “assault weapon

intended only to kill”... when you own it. The same firearm is “a patrol rifle used for defense” when in the hands of your local police. The only difference between you and the police is that the cop works for the state while you protect your family on your own.

The media must disguise the simple meaning of their message because we’d laugh in disbelief if they said it too plainly. Their message is this-

You’re dangerous and the elites are trustworthy.

Some people think they are more equal than others. Hate speech used to mean calling someone a nigger, a kike, or a jap. It morphed to calling someone an illegal immigrant or a woman. The elites call something “hate speech” when they claim a group needs special political treatment.

That claim of being an oppressed minority eventually leads to individuality. You are the ultimate minority group.. even though that is an anathema to socialists with their dependence on marxist theory and group identity. We are unique but are exactly equal in our human rights. To say otherwise is to subjugate our humanity to political interests. That subjugation requires some very twisted language... and some very dangerous government power.

You know the truth when you hear it. You also know when you’re told a lie. The answer is the same without regard to the social status of the person lying to you. Throw the lies back in their face.

--

slowfacts.wordpress.com/2019/02/02

The sheriffs resisting Washington’s new gun laws: ‘I’m not going to enforce that’

In Washington state, a ballot initiative and a raft of new bills may produce some of the tightest firearms regulations in the US. But standing in the way is a group of rural law enforcement officers who say point blank that they won’t enforce any of it.

The Klickitat county sheriff, Bob Songer, told the Guardian that the initiative passed last November “is unconstitutional on several grounds. I’ve taken the position that as an elected official, I am not going to enforce that law”.

Songer also cited ongoing litigation by the National Rifle Association gun industry lobby and others which aims to demonstrate the laws violate both the second amendment and the state’s constitution. He also said that if other agencies attempted to seize weapons from county residents under the auspices of the new laws, he would consider preventively “standing in their doorway”.

In November, the state’s voters handily passed an initiative, I-1639, which mostly targeted semi-automatic rifles. As of 1 January, purchasers of these weapons must now be over 21, undergo an enhanced background check, must have completed a safety course, and need to wait 9 days to take possession of their weapon. Also, gun owners who fail to store their weapons safely risk felony “community endangerment” charges.

Like other west coast states, Washington exhibits a deep cultural and political divide between its populous, coastal cities and its more sparsely populated rural hinterland.

I-1639 passed on a roughly 60-40 split; in the big, blue counties west of the Cascade Mountains, such as King county, where Seattle is located, the margins were even bigger.

27 of Washington's 39 counties rejected the ballot measure. Many of those counties are in the state's more rural, sparsely populated districts.

It is in these counties that many – including sworn officers – are promising to resist the laws--
theguardian.com 26 January 2019

Australia PM advisor says climate change is 'UN ruse to establish new world order'

By Jonathan Pearlman

Climate change is a hoax developed as part of a secret plot by the United Nations to undermine democracies and takeover the world, warned Maurice Newman, the chief business adviser to the Australian prime minister Tony Abbott.

Newman said the science showing links between human activity and the warming climate was wrong but was being used as a "hook" by the UN to expand its global control.

"This is not about facts or logic. It's about a new world order under the control of the UN," he wrote in *The Australian*.

"It is opposed to capitalism and freedom and has made environmental catastrophism a household topic to achieve its objective." Mr Newman, a staunch conservative and former chairman of the Australian Stock Exchange, has long been an outspoken critic of climate change science.

Mr Abbott, who himself is something of a climate change sceptic, once famously described climate change as "absolute cr**" – a comment he later recanted.

In his comment piece – described by critics as "whacko" – Mr Newman said the world has been "subjected to extravagance from climate catastrophists for close to 50 years".

"It's a well-kept secret, but 95 per cent of the climate models we are told prove the link between human CO2 emissions and catastrophic global warming have been found, after nearly two decades of temperature stasis, to be in error," he wrote.

"The real agenda is concentrated political authority. Global warming is the hook. Eco-catastrophists [...] have captured the UN and are extremely well funded.

They have a hugely powerful ally in the White House."

Environmental groups and scientists described Mr Newman as a 'crazed' conspiracy theorist and some called on him to resign.

The article was written by Mr Newman to coincide with a visit by Christiana Figueres, the UN climate change negotiation, who has urged Australia to reduce its reliance on coal. Australia is one of the world's biggest emitters of carbon emissions per capita.

-- telegraph.uk.co 08 May 2015

Yes, Venezuela is a Socialist Catastrophe

In the age of A.O.C. the lesson must be learned again.

By Bret Stephens

Conspicuous by its absence in much of the mainstream news coverage of Venezuela's political crisis is the word "socialism."

Socialist? Perish the thought.

Or so goes a line of argument that insists socialism's good name shouldn't be tarred by the results of experience. On Venezuela, what you're likelier to read is that the crisis is the product of corruption, cronyism, populism, authoritarianism, resource-dependency, U.S. sanctions and trickery, even the residues of capitalism itself. Just don't mention the S-word because, you know, it's working really well in Denmark.

Curiously, that's not how the Venezuelan regime's admirers used to speak of "21st century socialism," as it was dubbed by Hugo Chávez. The late Venezuelan president, said Britain's Jeremy Corbyn, "showed us there is a different and a better way of doing things. It's called socialism, it's called social justice, and it's something that Venezuela has made a big step toward." Noam Chomsky was similarly enthusiastic when he praised Chávez in 2009. "What's so exciting about at last visiting Venezuela," the linguist said, is that "I can see how a better world is being created."

Chomsky walked back some of his praise as Venezuela became more overtly dictatorial, but others on the left weren't as squeamish. In *The Nation*, NYU professor Greg Grandin opined, "the biggest problem Venezuela faced during his rule was not that Chávez was authoritarian but that he wasn't authoritarian enough."

At least Grandin could implicitly concede that socialism ultimately requires coercion to achieve its political aims; otherwise, it's human

nature for people to find loopholes and workarounds to keep as much of their property as they can.

Some of Chávez's erstwhile defenders would prefer to forget just how closely Venezuela followed the orthodox socialist script. Government spending on social programs? Check: From 2000 to 2013, spending rose to 40 percent of G.D.P., from 28 percent. Raising the minimum wage? Check. Nicolás Maduro, the current president, raised it no fewer than six times last year. An economy based on co-ops, not corporations? Check again. As Naomi Klein wrote in her fawning 2007 book, *"The Shock Doctrine,"* "Chávez has made the co-ops a top political priority ... By 2006, there were roughly 100,000 cooperatives in the country, employing more than 700,000 workers."

If the policy prescriptions were familiar, the consequences were predictable.

Government overspending created catastrophic deficits when oil prices plummeted. Worker co-ops wound up in the hands of incompetent and corrupt political cronies. The government responded to its budgetary problems by printing money, leading to inflation. Inflation led to price controls, leading to shortages. Shortages led to protests, leading to repression and the destruction of democracy. Thence to widespread starvation, critical medical shortages, an explosion in crime, and a refugee crisis to rival Syria's.

All of this used to be obvious enough, but in the age of Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez it has to be explained all over again. Why does socialism never work? Because, as Margaret Thatcher explained, "eventually you run out of other people's money."

The larger lesson of Venezuela's catastrophe should be learned. Twenty years of socialism, cheered by Corbyn, Klein, Chomsky and Co., led to the ruin of a nation. They may not be much embarrassed, much less personally harmed, by what they helped do. It's for the rest of us to take care that it never be done to us.

-- New York Times January 25, 2019

Ed.: A.O.C., (Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez), a 29-year old member of the Democratic Socialists of America, represents parts of Queens and Brooklyn in Congress.

Rethinking Judicial Restraint

By Roger Pilon

To establish individual liberty the Constitution enumerated the powers of Congress and the executive,

[the political branches of government], to limit them. And that, after all, is why the Bill of Rights concludes with the Ninth and Tenth amendments: to make clear that Americans begin and end with their rights, enumerated and unenumerated alike.

The judiciary, then, must not shirk its duty to secure those rights by deferring to the political branches. Rather, it must hold the acts of the other branches up to the light of strict constitutional scrutiny. There is no place for [Judge Robert Bork's doctrine of judicial] "restraint". Nor, of course, is there any place for the kind of "activism" that takes the judge beyond the Constitution. That document, however, is rich enough to enable the judge to discover the rights that are there to be discovered. To do that he must start with the text, of course. But where the text is broad or unclear he will have to go behind the document to the original understanding, including the theory of natural rights that informed that understanding, giving meaning to the text and legitimacy to the document as a whole. That is not unwarranted "activism". It is what judges are appointed to do.

In this regard, Judge Pasco Bowman of the Eighth Circuit recently remarked [to a packed audience at the Cato Institute] that the Constitution protects economic liberties no less than other civil rights – a view that the judicial restraint school abandoned in the wake of the New Deal [in the 1930s].

Not only did Judge Bowman speak of natural rights to property and contract, which he located in the Constitution, but he called into question a pair of judicial shibboleths invented by the New Deal Court that are subscribed to by liberals and conservatives alike: the idea that there are two "classes" of rights, "fundamental" (like freedom of speech) and "nonfundamental" (like freedom of contract); and two standards by which to review laws or acts purporting to violate those rights, "strict scrutiny" and "minimal scrutiny", respectively.

It is time, then, for conservatives to return to the vision of the founding. That vision begins with individual liberty. It secures that liberty by constituting a government of separated and divided powers. And it subjects those powers to the principled scrutiny of an independent judiciary.

Restraint in the exercise of that scrutiny is worse than out of place. It undermines the original design, enabling the political branches to move into the vacuum, which of course is

precisely what they have done. The irony is that conservatives, properly opposing the politicization of the law by the courts, have enabled our law to be politicized nonetheless through their misplaced restraint. The time has come to rethink "judicial restraint" and restore the judiciary to its rightful place in a system of separated powers.

-- Wall Street Journal Feb. 1, 1991

Ed.: Roger Pilon recently retired as the director of the Cato Institute's Center for Constitutional Studies.

Cato has reissued Pilon's 1991 oped, which lays out the case for "judicial engagement", as opposed to passive deference to presidential actions and congressional acts.

I Gave a Bounty Hunter \$300. Then He Located Our Phone

By Joseph Cox

T-Mobile, Sprint, and AT&T are selling access to their customers' location data, and that data is ending up in the hands of bounty hunters and others not authorized to possess it, letting them track most phones in the country.

Nervously, I gave a bounty hunter a phone number. He had offered to geolocate a phone for me, using a shady, overlooked service intended not for the cops, but for private individuals and businesses. Armed with just the number, he said he could find the current location of most phones in the U.S.

The bounty hunter sent the number to his contact who responded with a screenshot of Google Maps, containing a blue circle indicating the phone's current location, approximate to a few hundred metres.

The bounty hunter did this all without deploying a hacking tool or having any previous knowledge of the phone's whereabouts. Instead, the tracking tool relies on real-time location data sold to bounty hunters that ultimately originated from the telcos themselves, a Motherboard investigation has found.

Whereas it's common knowledge that law enforcement agencies can track phones with a warrant to service providers and IMSI catchers, at least one company, called Microbilt, is selling phone geolocation services with little oversight to car salesmen, property managers, bail bondsmen and bounty hunters, according to sources familiar with the company's products and company documents obtained by Motherboard. This spying capability is also being

resold to others on the black market who are not licensed by the company to use it, including me, seemingly without Microbilt's knowledge.

Your mobile phone is constantly communicating with nearby cell phone towers, so your telecom provider knows where to route calls and texts. From this, telecom companies also work out the phone's approximate location based on its proximity to those towers.

Telecom companies in the U.S. sell access to their customers' location to data aggregators, who then sell it to specific clients and industries. Last year, one location aggregator called LocationSmart faced harsh criticism for selling data that ultimately ended up in the hands of Securus, a company which provided phone tracking to low level enforcement without requiring a warrant. LocationSmart also exposed the very data it was selling through a buggy website panel, meaning anyone could geolocate nearly any phone in the United States at a click of a mouse.

Financial companies use phone location data to detect fraud; roadside assistance firms to locate stuck customers. But AT&T, for example, told Motherboard the use of its customers' data by bounty hunters goes explicitly against the company's policies, raising questions about how AT&T allowed the sale for this purpose in the first place

-- motherboard.vice.com Jan. 8, 2019

Gavin McInnes to Sue the Southern Poverty Law Center

Gavin McInnes is suing the Southern Poverty Law Center after the group designated his former organization The Proud Boys as an extremist hate group and accused McInnes of advocating violence.

The national demonization campaign against McInnes has come at personal cost to the former VICE co-founder. A Daily Beast article reveals in the fact that he faces regular confrontations with and harassment from his neighbors.

McInnes was also completely deplatformed by Twitter back in August.

McInnes is not the first high profile political figure to sue the SPLC in recent times. Last year, the group was forced to pay out \$3.4 million and issue an apology to British political activist Maajid Nawaz after they falsely listed him as an "anti-Muslim extremist" (Nawaz is a Muslim reformist who campaigns against extremism.)

-- Infowars.com February 4, 2019

Do Guns Cause Adolescents to Commit Suicide?

By Robert B. Young, MD
Short answer: No.

But you wouldn't know that from the media coverage of a study from the Boston University and Harvard's T.C. Chan's Schools of Public Health. "Household Gun Ownership and Youth Suicide Rates at the State Level, 2005–2015", in the *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* January 17.

Suicide is a complex problem. There are bound to be more firearms suicides in households that don't lock up their guns. But this does not mean firearms cause suicide any more than vehicles cause single-car crashes.

There is no evidence yet that controlling the availability of firearms is at all associated with changes in overall suicide rates. This is the most important finding about firearms and suicides. It suggests that, despite individual cases of preventable shooting deaths, on a population basis many people will commit suicide by other means.

International suicide studies confirm that the presence or absence of firearms among civilians is unrelated to the rate of suicide in various countries, which appears primarily to be culturally determined.

A couple of things make one presumptively question this study's findings. While correlating household firearm ownership with adolescent firearm suicide, the authors found no correlation with substance or alcohol abuse. This is a serious, well-documented risk factor in all suicides, although it may be less so in the earlier ages of their chosen cohort.

They also found no difference in households whether guns were known to be locked up or not.

Two things particularly make this study deceptive.

First, the ages of "youth" chosen range from 10-19 years old. These ages cannot fairly be considered the same kind of "youth" because they do not reflect the same sorts of risks....

Second, the authors counted gun ownership only as of 2004, while looking at suicide rates from 2005 through 2015, and basically averaging them. Obviously, changes [i.e., increases] in gun ownership rates from 2004 through 2015 should be accounted for.

Federal databases indicate that the number of guns per American (while the population simultaneously grows) increased from about 1.2 per

person in 2004 to about 1.4 in 2015. That's an increase of 17%.

According to the CDC, all suicides for ages 10-19 years (mostly with handguns) increased from about 5/100,000 in 2004 to about 6/100,000 in 2015, about 20%. The firearms suicide rate for these ages increased from about 2.1/100,000 to about 2.4/100,000, or about 14%. During this time, suffocation (including hanging) became the leading method for this age group's suicide; it used to be only half the number of suicides using firearms.

So, how can these enormous increases in gun ownership be responsible for such a relatively small increase in the rate of suicides? And how can firearms suicide be rising slower than suicide by all methods?

We know that more guns equals less crime, or at least does not increase it. We know that universal background checks do not change rates of violence or suicide. We know that reducing restrictive concealed carry legislation does not increase violent crime rates. We know that far more violence, death and injuries are prevented by civilian gun use than actually occur. We know that American gun ownership does not affect overall suicide rates.

In fact, there was a dip in adolescent firearm suicides (and their suicides overall) during the mid-2000's while gun ownership was consistently growing. The only correlation to be found is that firearm suicides generally parallel suicides by all methods.

Be sure to check our list of all the ways that researchers prejudice their findings: "Reading 'Gun Violence' Research Critically". Maybe you can pick out the several ways the Boston public health cabal did so here. And for fun and personal profit, read Dr. Przebinda's Spuriouser and Spuriouser. Correlation does not equal causation. Certainly not when conflating America's civilian gun ownership boom with adolescent firearm suicides.

Robert B. Young, MD is an associate clinical professor at the University of Rochester School of Medicine, and a Distinguished Life Fellow of the American Psychiatric Association.

-- *thetruthaboutguns.org* Feb. 03, 2019

Uncle Sam Wants Your DNA: The FBI's Diabolical Plan to Create a Nation of Suspects

By John Whitehead

Get ready, folks, because the Rapid DNA Act - plus Congress (which

allows police to collect DNA immediately following arrests), the courts (which have ruled that police can take DNA samples from people who are arrested but not yet convicted of a crime), and local police agencies (which desire this new crime-fighting gadget)—is embarking on a campaign to create a nation of suspects predicated on a national DNA database.

As the *New York Times* reports:

"the Rapid DNA Act, which, starting this year, will enable approved police booking stations in several states to connect their Rapid DNA machines to Codis, the national DNA database. Genetic fingerprinting is set to become as routine as the old-fashioned kind."

These Rapid DNA machines—about the size of a desktop printer - can produce DNA profiles in less than two hours—allow police to go on fishing expeditions for any hint of possible misconduct.

Journalist Heather Murphy explains: "As police agencies build out their local DNA databases, they are collecting DNA not only from people who have been charged with major crimes but also, increasingly, from people who are merely deemed suspicious, permanently linking their genetic identities to criminal databases."

Suspect Society, meet the American police state.

Every dystopian sci-fi film is converging into a trifecta between science, technology and government: By tapping your phone lines, uploading your emails, reading your Facebook posts, monitoring your movements through license plate readers, the government knows [almost everything].

And by accessing your DNA, the government will soon know everything: your ancestry, what you look like, your health history, your inclination to follow orders, etc.

We are no longer "innocent until proven guilty" in the face of DNA evidence that places us at the scene of a crime, behavior sensing technology that interprets our body temperature and facial tics as suspicious, and surveillance devices that cross-check our biometrics, license plates and DNA against a database of unsolved crimes and potential criminals.

A 2013 Supreme Court ruling in *Maryland v. King* allowed the government to take DNA samples from people "arrested" in connection with "serious" crimes.

The Court in *Raynor v. Maryland* determined that individuals

do not have a right to privacy when it comes to their DNA.

Glenn Raynor, a suspected rapist, refused to provide them with a DNA sample.

No problem. Police simply swabbed the chair in which Raynor had been sitting; Raynor's DNA was a match, and the suspect became a convict.

All 50 states now maintain their own DNA databases. Some are being uploaded to CODIS (Combined DNA Index System), the FBI's DNA database, a de facto way to identify and track the American people from birth to death.

We are all suspects in a DNA lineup until circumstances and science say otherwise.

Of course, there are positive uses of DNA, when it is used to absolve someone on death row of a crime he didn't commit.

Despite the insistence by government agents that DNA is infallible, *New York Times* reporter Andrew Pollack makes a convincing case that DNA evidence can, in fact, be fabricated. Israeli scientists "fabricated blood and saliva samples containing DNA from a person other than the donor of the blood and saliva," stated Pollack. "They also showed that if they had access to a DNA profile in a database, they could construct a sample of DNA to match that profile without obtaining any tissue from that person." -- www.rutherford.org Jan 22, 2019

Gallup:120 million people want to migrate to the U.S.

By Penny Starr

The survey company asked half a million people in 152 countries between 2015 and 2017 about their plans. The survey showed that the number of adults in the United States would rise by 46 percent — or 120 million people — if foreigners were freely allowed to move into the U.S.

Gallup asked respondents two questions:

Ideally, if you had the opportunity, would you like to move permanently to another country, or would you prefer to continue living in this country?

(If respondents "would like to move permanently to another country") To which country would you like to move? [Open-ended, one response allowed]

Gallup's Migration Research Center conducted the "world poll."

According to the Department of Homeland Security, 1,127,167 migrants were granted lawful

permanent resident status in the U.S. in 2017. That huge inflow delivered one legal immigrant for every four Americans who turned 18 in 2017.

-- www.breitbart.com/2019/02/11

Report: Islamic State boasts \$300 million cash hoard for future attacks on the West

Islamic State terrorists have a war chest of up to \$300 million in cash to help sustain future operations and fund new attacks on the West, according to a United Nations report.

The money is "bulk-stored" in its last remaining stronghold area, while the rest has been smuggled abroad or invested in legitimate businesses.

Even if Islamic State militants are forced out of their last Syria holdout this week, the group has other financial assets "with a strategic view to funding larger-scale attacks once the opportunity arises again," the report says.

But the U.N report also warns that foreign fighters and the extremists' dependents will still pose a threat even after the Islamic State organization is defeated.

And the report notes that despite losing physical ground, Islamic State still has up to 18,000 loyal members in its ranks in Syria and Iraq — including 3,000 foreign terrorist fighters.

-- www.breitbart.com/2019/02/12

Gun-seizure laws grow in popularity since Parkland shooting

By Ryan J. Foley

Fourteen states have "red flag" laws making it easier to take guns away from people who may be suicidal or bent on violence against others.

More than 1,700 orders allowing guns to be seized for up to a year were issued in 2018 by the courts.

The laws gained momentum after a young man, widely known to be mentally troubled yet had access to weapons, killed 17 students and staff members at a Parkland, Florida high school last year.

Florida passed a red flag law in the wake of the shooting. New York, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Rhode Island and Vermont also have adopted variations. California, Connecticut, Indiana, Oregon and Washington already had similar laws.

Several states are debating them this year, including New Mexico,

where two students were killed in a school shooting in December 2017.

Connecticut has the nation's longest-standing red flag law, which went into effect in 1999 after a mass shooting at the state lottery office

One study found that the Connecticut law reduced gun suicides by more than 10 percent in recent years and that a similar law in Indiana led to a 7.5 percent drop.

"It really gives us a unique opportunity as prosecutors to come in before the violence has occurred. Often we are tackling it on the other side," said Kimberly Wyatt, a prosecutor in King County, Washington, who has been seeking one or two such orders per week in and around Seattle.

Gun-rights advocates argue that the laws can be used unfairly based on unproven accusations.

Debates in state legislatures often turn on how much due process gun owners should receive and who can petition for the orders. In some states, only police can file the petitions. Other states allow members of the person's household, relatives, school officials, employers and health care providers to do so.

Most states allow for temporary orders that are issued for days or weeks. Judges then hold hearings to decide whether to extend them for up to one year.

-- AP February 10, 2019

Local gun groups flex muscle in state politics, sidestepping the NRA

By Daniel Trotta

(Reuters) - When Missouri Senate Bill 656 was introduced in 2016, it was relatively modest legislation that proposed capping the amount county sheriffs could charge for a concealed handgun permit.

By the time it passed, with both houses of the state legislature overturning the governor's veto, it had become one of the most expansive gun-rights laws in the country.

The group some lawmakers credited with providing crucial momentum was not so much the National Rifle Association but rather the Missouri Firearms Coalition, an aggressive grassroots operation founded in 2015.

With major gun-rights legislation stalled in Washington, much of the action has shifted to the states, where self-described "no compromise" groups have mobilized activists in favor of pro-gun laws, according to Reuters interviews.

"It's always kind of interesting when people in the gun control community talk about how radical the NRA is," said Gregg Pruett, president of the Idaho Second Amendment Alliance, whose group organized an email and telephone campaign to pass a 2016 Idaho law allowing people to carry concealed handguns without a permit, also known as "constitutional carry."

"There's an entire movement on the other side of the NRA ... We're done compromising," he said.

State-level alternatives to the NRA have proliferated this decade and are active in at least 15 states.

The most uncompromising among them say the NRA has become too timid and too willing to back measures such as removing firearms from people deemed dangerous.

Still, the NRA, with more than 5 million members, is by far the most powerful and well-connected gun lobby. It has protected firearms manufacturers from liability for gun violence and pushed a ban on U.S. health officials from promoting gun control. In 2005 it shepherded through Florida's landmark "stand your ground" law, then repeated the feat in nearly half the states.

From 2015 to 2017, seven states passed constitutional carry laws, including Idaho, Maine, New Hampshire, West Virginia and Missouri, where local groups not affiliated with the NRA claim significant roles in getting the legislation passed. It is now the law in a dozen states.

-- October. 8, 2018

No Charges for Dad Who Shot 2 Cops to Protect His Daughter from Unlawful Raid on His Home

By Rachel Blevins

District Heights, MD – A 9-man team of police officers who were serving a search warrant at the wrong house encountered an armed father who was trying to protect his daughter from what he believed were intruders.

George's County Police

Chief Hank Stawinski claimed the warrant was originally granted because a "confidential informant" told officers that a drug dealer was living at the residence.

When the officers broke down the door, they encountered a man holding a shotgun. He fired a single shot, which Stawinski claimed hit two of the officers. However, when the man realized the intruders were police officers, he dropped his weapon and begged them not to shoot his daughter.

While one of the officers returned fire, no one was hit, and the officers who were shot by the homeowner are in stable condition.

Because police admitted that they attempted to serve a search warrant at the wrong home, because they acknowledge that any attempt to press charges against the innocent man could result in a costly lawsuit, and likely because no one was killed during the incident, Stawinski confirmed that no charges would be filed against the man who shot the officers.

The police chief also admitted that his department needs more training when determining search warrants and deciding to break into houses based on rumors from confidential informants.

-- freedomoutpost.com Sept. 29, 2018

Studies: Arming Teachers Is Likely Not an Effective Deterrent for School Shootings

By Kate Elizabeth Queram

Arming teachers to protect against school shootings is likely less effective than other safety measures, including laws that hold gun owners responsible when minors get a hold of negligently stored firearms, according to the Rockefeller Institute of Government, the public policy research arm of the State University of New York.

"While no data exist to support the assertion that the presence of armed individuals has been or would be successful in stopping school

shootings, there is evidence that indicates such a policy would fail to meet its intended goals," says Jaclyn Schildkraut, an associate professor of criminal justice at SUNY Oswego.

The idea of arming teachers was one of many school safety proposals floated in the wake of the mass shooting at Marjory Stoneman-Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. President Trump and the National Rifle Association have supported the measure, and versions of the policy have advanced in school districts across the country, including in Florida and Texas.

But studies reviewed by Schildkraut found that hit rates—the number of times a bullet hits its intended target—were on average around 20 percent.

"Even in active shooter training simulations, police officers hit their intended target just one in every five times they fire their weapons," the article says.

Civilians, including teachers, "receive considerably less firearms training in general as compared to law enforcement officers and such instruction does not typically include stress-inducing simulations," Schildkraut notes. That means it's likely that "their accuracy rate during a shooting would be considerably lower, even if they were to receive more extensive training."

Placing more guns at the scene of a mass shooting could also complicate the situation for responding law enforcement officers, who "would have to spend additional time discerning who is the shooter and who is just a Good Samaritan trying to bring the attack to an end." That could lead to a delay in medical treatment for victims and could also increase the likelihood "that police will injure or kill someone who is not the shooter."

-- www.route fifty.com October 2, 2018

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

Back issues, from 1997 to date, can be found online. Just go to: <https://archive.org/> and in the Search Field, type in "New Jersey Militia Newsletter". So grab the PDFs and pass them around via email to others who have never seen the hard copies.

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Wake County, NC, Dave (919) 375-4840

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State ____ Zip _____